

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1-13 and 15-28 were rejected. Claims 1-3, 11, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 26, and 28 have been amended. Claim 25 has been cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 11 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The antecedent basis issues in those claims have been corrected by amendment.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-13, 15-22, and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by *Keller* et al. (US Publication 2003/0050849A1) in view of *Jani* et al. (US Publication 2005/0049974 A1).

As to claim 1, the Office Action at page 4 concedes that *Keller* does not teach “determining whether to process data in the store based on relevant store node processing conditions wherein the store node processing conditions comprise a need for the transformed data in the store node and an availability of processing resources.” The Office Action states that *Jani* teaches this element missing from *Keller* and that it would have been obvious to combine the two teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Jani*’s “intermediary” as depicted in Fig. 7a routes payment requests to whatever worker thread is available. The only consideration in *Jani*

is availability. *Jani* does *not* take into account the processing condition of a need for the transformed data. *Jani*'s intermediary, unlike the enterprise node of the instant application, has no knowledge whatsoever of whether any local nodes need the transformed data.

Neither *Keller* nor *Jani*, individually, or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed element of “determining at one of the plurality of store nodes whether to process the transaction log data in the store node based on relevant store node processing conditions, wherein the store node processing conditions comprise a need for the transformed data in the store node.” Further, neither *Keller* nor *Jani* teach or suggest the amended claim element “wherein the enterprise node comprises data on all of the store nodes.” Therefore, claim 1 is not unpatentable over *Keller* in view of *Jani* and its rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 – 13 and 15 – 17 are dependent upon claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons that their parent claim is allowable.

Claim 18 is a system counterpart to claim 1 and contains the element of “logic for determining a period of time when the transaction log data is to be processed, and for determining whether to process the transaction log data in the store node based on store node processing conditions, wherein the store node processing conditions comprise one of a need for the transformed data in the store node.” The Office Action at page 7 concedes that *Keller* does not teach “and for determining whether to process the transaction log data in the store node based on store node processing conditions, wherein the store node processing conditions comprise one of a need for the transformed data in the first node and a demand for processing in the first node during the period of time.” The Office Action states that this missing element is taught by *Jani*.

However, as stated earlier with respect to claim 1, *Jani* does not take into consideration “a need for the transformed data” in routing its credit card transactions. *Jani* determines whether to process a payment depending on whether a worker thread is available. Claim 18 requires processing transaction log data at the store node if there is a demand for the data at the store node at a relevant time. *Jani* does not teach or suggest this limitation whether viewed alone or in combination with *Keller*. Claim 18 therefore contains allowable subject matter and its rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 20, and 21 are dependent upon system claim 18 are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that their parent claim is allowable.

Claim 22 is a program product counterpart of claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that its counterpart claim is allowable.

Claim 25 has been cancelled.

The Office Action rejected claims 23-24 and 26-28 under USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Keller et al.* in view of *O'Neill et al.* (US Publication Number 2003/0069968 A1).

Claim 23 has been amended to incorporate the element of: “determining whether to transform the transaction log data to transformed data based on relevant enterprise node conditions, and based on relevant store node conditions, wherein relevant store node conditions comprise the need for the transformed data at the store node and the availability of processing resources to process the raw business data at the store node.” The Office Action has already conceded that this element is not taught by *Keller*. Applicant submits that it is not taught by

O'Neill either. *O'Neill's* load balancing server does not take into consideration "a need for the transformed data; it merely dispatches transactions based on load-balancing criteria.

Claim 24 is dependent on claim 23 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 23.

Claim 25 has been cancelled.

Claims 26-28 are dependent on claim 23 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 23 is allowable.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

Date: February 4, 2008

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.
8540 S.W. 83 Street
Miami, Florida 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)